

II. Remarks

In the Final Office Action dated July 23, 2008, the Examiner rejected claims 2-4, 6, 7, 14, 23 and 27 for being indefinite.

The Examiner also rejected claims 2, 9, 12, 13, 15, 19-22, and 25-28 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,011,821 to Neal ("Neal") in view of U.S. Patent No. 931,327 to Manzel ("Manzel"). In addition, the Examiner rejected claims 3, 4, and 11 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Neal in view of Manzel, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,444,125 to Welsch ("Welsch"). Finally, the Examiner rejected claims 10, 18, and 24 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Neal in view of Manzel, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 586,276 to Seelinger ("Seelinger").

The Examiner also declared claims 6, 7, 14, and 23 to be allowable if rewritten to overcome the indefinite objections.

A. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112

1. Rejection of Claims 2-4, 6, 7, 14, 23 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. § 112

The Examiner rejected claims 2-4, 6, 7, 14, 23 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 6, 7, and 14 have been amended to clarify how the engagement and counter-engagement elements are being claimed. It should be noted that two engagement elements and two counter-engagement elements are now present in claims 6 and 7. In addition, claims 23 and 27 have been amended to cure the deficiencies noted by the Examiner.

B. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

1. Rejection of Claims 19-22 and 25-27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Neal in View of Manzel

The Examiner rejected claims 19-22 and 25-27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Neal in view of Manzel. Neal discloses a socket including a bushing formed from an elastomeric material which is press-fit within a sleeve. Neal at col.1, ll.59-60. The upper ends of the legs scrub tightly against the inside of the bushing walls for substantially the entire length of the bushings to form a solid and relatively wobble-free interconnection between the top unit and the legs. Neal at col.2, ll.8-15. As such, Neal discloses an elastomeric mounting component designed to eliminate movement or rotation relative to the leg or socket. Neal fails to at least disclose a mounting component which “comprises a helical engagement member drawing the leg into the socket when the leg is rotated relative to the socket” as claimed in independent claim 19. Indeed, Neal teaches away from such a mounting component. In addition, as the Examiner noted, Neal fails to teach a pin on the leg and a mating helical segment in the mounting component. Neal also fails to teach a pin that does not penetrate beyond an outer surface of the mounting component. Manzel fails to fill this gap.

Manzel discloses a drill chuck adapted to receive machine tools. Manzel at p.1, ll.8-13. Manzel discloses projecting ends (pin D) which are adapted to enter notches (e) formed on an axial socket (B) when the vertical portions of the slot (g) are in line with the notches (e). Manzel at p.1, ll.40-43; p.1, line 110 - p.2, line 2; Fig. 2, 5. The drill chuck disclosed in Manzel also makes use of an outer locking sleeve (F) with vertical and horizontal portions (g, and g¹ respectively). Manzel at p.1, ll.48-51. The projecting ends of pin D in Manzel extend

past the axial socket notches (e) and thus extend past the outer surface of the axial socket (B). Manzel at p.1, ll.29-31; Fig. 2, 5. Manzel fails to teach a pin that does not penetrate beyond an outer surface of the mounting component as claimed in independent claim 19. As such, the combination of Neal and Manzel fails to disclose that which is claimed in amended independent claim 19.

Additionally, in Manzel, the pin (D) extends past the inner member (B) and into the outer locking sleeve (g, g¹). Manzel discloses an inner member (B) as well as an outer member (F) which combine to lock the pin (D) and collet (C) in the socket (A). This combination of elements is different than the mounting component claimed in independent claim 19. Indeed, the combination of elements in Manzel cannot function to lock the collet (C) to the socket (A) without the two separate parts (B and F). As such, the combination of Neal and Manzel fails to disclose a mounting component as claimed in independent claim 19. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the rejection of amended independent claim 19 be withdrawn.

Finally, one of ordinary skill in the art would not combine the rotational elements of Manzel with the elastomeric mounting component of Neal. Use of an elastomeric friction fit as seen in Neal would not allow the rotation contemplated by Manzel, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not combine these elements. Accordingly, the combination of Neal and Manzel fails to disclose that which is claimed by independent claim 19, as well as the claims that depend from it.

C. Allowable Subject Matter

The Examiner deemed claims 6, 7, 14, and 23 allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112 and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant has amended claims 6, 7, and 14 to comply with the Examiner's requirements. As such, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner allow claims 6, 7, and 14. In addition, Applicant amended claim 19 to add additional limitations. As such, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner allow dependent claim 23 in its present form.